



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff,
v.
DAVID ANTHONY RODRIGUEZ,
Defendant.

No. 2:25-CR-00486-ODW

I N F O R M A T I O N

[18 U.S.C. § 241: Conspiracy
Against Rights; 18 U.S.C.
§ 924(d)(1) and 28 U.S.C.
§ 2461(c): Criminal Forfeiture]

The United States Attorney charges:

[18 U.S.C. § 241]

A. INTRODUCTORY ALLEGATIONS

At times relevant to this Information:

1. The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department ("LASD") was a law enforcement agency within the Central District of California. Among other responsibilities, the LASD provided municipal police services within Los Angeles County, California, through its thousands of sworn deputies.

1 2. Defendant DAVID ANTHONY RODRIGUEZ and Eric Chase Saavedra
2 ("Saavedra") were sworn law enforcement officers employed by the
3 LASD. As LASD deputies, defendant RODRIGUEZ and Saavedra were
4 subject to an oath of duty and rules of conduct. This oath and these
5 rules prohibited LASD personnel from using their law enforcement
6 status and related equipment for personal use or for non-legitimate
7 law enforcement purposes.

8 3. Defendant RODRIGUEZ was a detective assigned to LASD's
9 Operation Safe Streets Bureau and was a sworn law enforcement officer
10 for 16 years.

11 4. Defendant RODRIGUEZ knew and understood that the
12 Constitution and laws of the United States protect the right to be
13 free from unreasonable searches and seizures and the right to be free
14 from deprivation of property without due process of law by one acting
15 under color of law.

16 5. Saavedra owned a company that provided private security
17 services for clients. The company often employed active LASD
18 deputies and law enforcement officers. Defendant RODRIGUEZ worked
19 for the private security company.

20 6. Person 1 was a wealthy Los Angeles-based client of the
21 private security company who was engaged in an ongoing dispute with
22 her husband, Victim T.F.

23 B. OBJECT OF THE CONSPIRACY

24 7. Beginning on a date unknown and continuing through in or
25 around August 2022, in Los Angeles County, within the Central
26 District of California, and elsewhere, defendant RODRIGUEZ, and
27 others known and unknown to the United States Attorney, conspired and
28 agreed with each other to knowingly and intentionally oppress,

1 threaten, and intimidate a person of the State of California and the
2 State of Utah, namely, Victim T.F., in the free exercise and
3 enjoyment of rights secured to him by the Constitution and laws of
4 the United States, that is, the right to be free from unreasonable
5 searches and seizures and the right to be free from deprivation of
6 property without due process of law by one acting under color of law.

7 C. MANNER AND MEANS OF THE CONSPIRACY

8 8. The object of the conspiracy was to be accomplished, in
9 substance, as follows:

10 a. Saavedra would earn contracts for clients of his
11 private security company, including Person 1.

12 b. Saavedra would hire active LASD deputies to act as
13 personal bodyguards for Person 1, including defendant RODRIGUEZ.

14 c. Person 1 would inform defendant RODRIGUEZ about Victim
15 T.F., with whom she had personal and/or monetary disputes.

16 d. Defendant RODRIGUEZ would use his powers as a sworn
17 law enforcement officer to improperly obtain a court-authorized
18 search warrant to obtain GPS location information associated with
19 Victim T.F.'s cellular phone.

20 e. Defendant RODRIGUEZ would track Victim T.F.'s physical
21 location using the GPS pings and share the information with Saavedra.

22 f. LASD deputies and other co-conspirators would use
23 information obtained from the court-authorized search warrant to
24 locate, oppress, intimidate, harass, and threaten Victim T.F.

25 D. OVERT ACTS

26 On or about the following dates, in furtherance of the
27 conspiracy, and to accomplish the object of the conspiracy, defendant
28 RODRIGUEZ, and others known and unknown to the United States

1 Attorney, committed and caused to be committed various overt acts
2 within the Central District of California, and elsewhere, including
3 the following:

4 Overt Act No. 1: On July 16, 2022, defendant RODRIGUEZ
5 applied for and obtained a search warrant under false pretenses from
6 a Los Angeles County Superior Court judge authorizing law enforcement
7 officers to obtain GPS location information associated with two
8 telephone numbers, including Victim T.F.'s telephone number.
9 Specifically, in the sworn affidavit supporting the search warrant,
10 defendant RODRIGUEZ falsely declared that Victim T.F.'s telephone
11 number was associated with a suspect in a robbery investigation.
12 Defendant RODRIGUEZ knew Victim T.F.'s phone number had no relation
13 to the suspect of the robbery investigation.

14 Overt Act No. 2: In or around mid-July 2022, soon after
15 securing the illegally obtained search warrant for GPS location
16 information associated with Victim T.F.'s phone, defendant RODRIGUEZ
17 began receiving pings from the service provider for Victim T.F.'s
18 phone, which provided the approximate location of Victim T.F.'s
19 phone.

20 Overt Act No. 3: In or around mid-July 2022, defendant
21 RODRIGUEZ shared the GPS location information with Saavedra.

1 FORFEITURE ALLEGATION

2 [18 U.S.C. § 924(d)(1) and 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c)]

3 1. Pursuant to Rule 32.2 of the Federal Rules of Criminal
4 Procedure, notice is hereby given that the United States of America
5 will seek forfeiture as part of any sentence, pursuant to Title 18,
6 United States Code, Section 924(d)(1), and Title 28, United States
7 Code, Section 2461(c), in the event of the defendant's conviction of
8 the offense set forth in this Information.

9 2. If so convicted, defendant shall forfeit to the United
10 States of America the following:

11 (a) All right, title, and interest in any firearm or
12 ammunition involved in or used in any such offense; and

13 (b) To the extent such property is not available for
14 forfeiture, a sum of money equal to the total value of the property
15 described in subparagraph (a).

16 3. Pursuant to Title 21, United States Code, Section 853(p),
17 as incorporated by Title 28, United States Code, Section 2461(c), the
18 convicted defendant shall forfeit substitute property, up to the
19 value of the property described in the preceding paragraph if, as the
20 result of any act or omission of said defendant, the property
21 described in the preceding paragraph or any portion thereof (a)
22 cannot be located upon the exercise of due diligence; (b) has been
23 transferred, sold to, or deposited with a third party; (c) has been
24 placed beyond the jurisdiction of the court; (d) has been

25 //

26 //

1 substantially diminished in value; or (e) has been commingled with
2 other property that cannot be divided without difficulty.

3
4 BILAL A. ESSAYLI
United States Attorney

5 
6 CHRISTINA T. SHAY
7 Assistant United States Attorney
8 Chief, Criminal Division

9
10 THOMAS RYBARCZYK
11 Assistant United States Attorney
12 Acting Chief, Public Corruption
13 and Civil Rights Section

14
15 MAXWELL COLL
16 Assistant United States Attorney
17 Cyber & Intellectual Property
18 Crimes Section

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28